

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

**GI**

**JAN 12 2005**

FILE:

Office: ST. PAUL

Date:

IN RE:

Obligor:

Bonded Alien

IMMIGRATION BOND:

Bond Conditioned for the Delivery of an Alien under Section 103 of the  
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1103

ON BEHALF OF OBLIGOR:

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

*Mari Johnson*

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The delivery bond in this matter was declared breached by the Field Office Director, Detention and Removal, St. Paul, Minnesota, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The record indicates that on December 9, 2002, the obligor posted a \$7,500 bond conditioned for the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien (Form I-340) dated September 22, 2004, was sent via certified mail, return receipt requested. The notice demanded the bonded alien's surrender into the custody of an officer of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) at 9:00 a.m. on October 13, 2004, at [REDACTED]. The obligor failed to present the alien, and the alien failed to appear as required. On October 15, 2004, the field office director informed the obligor that the delivery bond had been breached.

The Form I-352 provides that the obligor and co-obligor are jointly and severally liable for the obligations imposed by the bond contract. As such, ICE may pursue a breach of bond against one or both of the contracting parties. *See Restatement (Third) of Suretyship and Guaranty* § 50 (1996). Consequently, the record clearly establishes that the notice was properly served on either the obligor or the co-obligor in compliance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(a)(2)(iv). Reference in this decision to the obligor is equally applicable to the co-obligor and vice versa.

8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) states, in pertinent part:

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

On appeal, counsel merely requests an extension of time in order to file a brief and/or evidence. To date, counsel has presented no brief and/or evidence.

Inasmuch as counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact as a basis for the appeal, the regulations mandate the summary dismissal of the appeal.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.